

### Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

angie.rodriguez@st.com ip.us@st.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/726,350	KOBAYASHI, OSAMU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	PHUC H. TRAN	2471
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
<ul> <li>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</li> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earmed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>		
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 July 2009</u> .		
	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-9,11-15 and 17-20</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)X Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-9,11-15 and 17-20</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) All b) Some * c) None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage		
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	1) Intonviour Summer	ry (PTO-413)
<ul> <li>2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> </ul>	4) 🔛 Interview Summai Paper No(s)/Mail I	
<ul> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>		Patent Application
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### **Claim Objections**

1. Claims 13,14,15,17, and18 are objected to because of the following informalities: the term "computer readable medium for storing a computer code which executes by processor" should be rewritten as "a non-transitory computer-readable storage medium for storing an executable code by processor". Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

### 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant asserts that the claim element "means for communicating..."; "means for forming..."; "means for associating..."; "means for transmitting..." are a means plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, six paragraph. However, it is unclear whether the claim element is a means plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C 112 six paragraph, because it is unclear whether the claim limitation is modified by sufficient structure for performing the claimed function or it is unclear whether the corresponding structure is sufficiently disclosed in the written description of the specification. If applicant wishes to have the claim limitation treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, six paragraph, applicant is required to:

a. Show that the claim limitation is written as a function to be performed and the claim does not recite sufficient structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function which would preclude application of 35 U.S.C. 112, six paragraph. For more information, see MPEP 2181.

b. Amend the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites

what structure, material or acts perform the claimed function without introducing any

new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)).

## **Double Patenting**

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321<sup>©</sup> or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-3,5-9,11-15,17-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application

# Application/Control Number: 10/726,350 Art Unit: 2471

No. 10/726895. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of following:

6. With respect to claims, the copending Application discloses in a packet based multimedia system having a multimedia source device coupled to a multimedia display device by way of a bi-directional auxiliary channel arranged to transfer information between the display device and the source device and vice versa and a unidirectional main link arranged to carry multimedia data packets from the multimedia source device to the multimedia display device, a method of reducing multimedia packet overhead (see claim 1, lines 1-9 of copending '95), comprising: prior to commencement of transmission of the data packets from the source device to the display device over the main link, communicating via the auxiliary channel data packet attributes to the display device (see claim 1, lines 10-13 of copending '95);

forming a reduced size data packet header for each of the data packets wherein the reduced size is commensurate with the data packet attributes already communicated via the auxiliary channel; associating the reduced size data packet header with a corresponding one of the data packets (see claim 1, lines 19-20 of copending '95); and

transmitting the data packet and associated reduced size data packet header from the source device to the display device over the main link (see claim 1, lines 21-23 of copending '05), wherein the bi-directional auxiliary channel is formed of a uni-directional back channel configured to carry information from the display device to the source device and a uni-directional forward channel included as part of the main channel for carrying information from the source device to the display device in concert with the back channel (see claim 4, lines 1-7 of copending '95).

# Application/Control Number: 10/726,350 Art Unit: 2471

For claims of Application merely broadened the scope of the copending Application's claim by eliminating "interspersing special characters that allow the display device to distinguish each bit of pixel data including in the data packets thereby requiring only a small FIFO type buffer unit. It has been held that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. In re karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note Ex Parte Raine, 168 USPQ 375 (bd. App. 1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not need would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### **Response to Amendment**

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHUC H. TRAN whose telephone number is (571)272-3172. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CHI PHAM can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

# Application/Control Number: 10/726,350 Art Unit: 2471

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PHUC H TRAN/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2471